



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,896	03/11/2004	Eric D. Rabinovsky	AVS1-0034	7397
70225	7590	01/05/2010	EXAMINER	
JACKSON WALKER LLP 901 MAIN STREET SUITE 6000 DALLAS, TX 75202			TON, THAIAN N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1632	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/05/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/798,896	Applicant(s) RABINOVSKY ET AL.
	Examiner Thaian N. Ton	Art Unit 1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17, 21-24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 38, 41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 17,21-24,26,28,29,31,38,41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/25/09 has been entered.

Applicants' Amendment and Response has been entered. Claims 17 and 41 are amended; claims 43 and 44 are cancelled; claims 17, 21-24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 38, 41 and 42 are pending and under current examination.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claims 17-38 (group II), SEQ ID NO:1 and stimulating angiogenesis as the goal of the claimed treatment method in the response on 2/2/2006 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The prior rejection of claims 17, 21-24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 38, 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claim which no longer recites the limitation "or functional biological equivalent thereof" in the third to last line of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The prior rejection of claims 17, 21, 31, 33, 38 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alila *et al.* is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment

to the claims, which now require electroporation of the muscle tissue and utilizing a synthetic myogenic promoter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following rejections are withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claims which now require electroporation of the muscle tissue and utilizing a synthetic myogenic promoter:

1. The prior rejection of claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alila *et al.* further in view of van Deutekom *et al.* (Mol. Med. Today, 214-220, May 1998) is withdrawn
2. The prior rejection of claims 17, 24, 28, 29, 41, 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alila *et al.* (cited above) in view of Draghia-Akli (cited previously), Fewell et al (cited previously), and Isner (cited previously).

A new rejection appears below.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 17, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 38, 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alila *et al.* (cited above) in view of Draghia-Akli (cited previously), Fewell *et al.* (cited previously), Gonçalves (Cardiovascular Res., 45: 294-302, 2000), Nicosia *et al.* (American J. of Pathology, 145(5): 1023-1029, 1994) and Isner (cited previously).

Alila *et al.* teach the construction of a plasmid (pIG0552), which contains the 5' portion of the chicken skeletal α -actin gene enhancer/promoter, which is operably linked to the human IGF-I cDNA, and flanked by the 3' portion of human growth hormone UTR (see page 1786, 1st col., 1st ¶ and Figure 1). They teach the purified plasmid was formulated with a complex with PVP (polyvinylpyrrolidone) and then intramuscularly injected into the hind limb of rats (see p. 1787, 1st col., Animal Injections). The muscle samples were then harvested and frozen at various time points and analyzed for hIGF-I expression. Alila *et al.* teach that hIGF-I expression was found localized in the injected muscles (see p. 1790, col. 1-2, bridging ¶). Alila teach intramuscular injection of a construct with a myogenic promoter (chicken skeletal α -actin), which is operably linked to a nucleic acid sequence encoding IGF-I, operably linked to a 3'UTR region, and they teach the expression of this plasmid construct localized to muscle tissue. They teach the limitations of claim 42 because Alila teach the human growth hormone 3'UTR. Alila *et al.* further teach specific embodiments of the claims in that they teach delivery via a single administration (claim 31); delivery into muscle which are diploid cells (claim 33); and that the subject is an animal (rat) (claim 38).

However, Alila *et al.* does not teach a synthetic myogenic promoter that comprises SEQ ID NO:3 (i.e., the synthetic myogenic promoter termed SPc5-12) (claims 17 and 41), nor do they teach a nucleic acid construct comprising an amino

acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 4 (claim 24), or an expression construct that comprises SEQ ID NO: 1 (claim 26) and Alila does not teach transfection enhancing techniques/compounds such as electroporation or transfection facilitating polypeptides as a means to deliver nucleic acids to cells (claims 17, 28, 29).

However, prior to the time of the claimed invention, Draghia-Akli teaches a myogenic promoter consisting of the nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:3 (i.e. the synthetic myogenic promoter termed SPc5-12). Draghia-Akli teaches a plasmid construct comprising the SPc5-12 promoter operably linked to a nucleic acid encoding human growth hormone releasing hormone (GHRH; page 1182, col. 2, paragr. 3). Draghia-Akli teaches intramuscular injection of said plasmid construct into pigs and then electroporating the injected muscle of said pig to more efficiently deliver said plasmid to the muscle cells (page 1180: col. 1, paragr. 4, line 1 to col. 2, line 10). Thus, Draghia-Akli teaches that said SPc5-12 promoter is a powerful synthetic muscle promoter that drives high level expression of operably linked heterologous nucleic acids in a muscle-specific manner (page 1180, col. 1, lines 1-2).

Fewell teaches intramuscular injection of plasmid DNA complexed with the charge polypeptide poly-L-glutamate into mice followed by electroporation. Fewell teaches that injection of a plasmid comprising a nucleic acid encoding factor IX and that injection of a plasmid comprising a nucleic acid encoding erythropoietin as such (i.e. forming a complex comprising said plasmids and poly-L-glutamate prior to injection) resulted in enhanced expression of said plasmids compared to when said plasmids were injected as saline solution (i.e. when said plasmids were not complexed with poly-L-glutamate). Thus, Fewell teaches that intramuscular injection of plasmid DNA complexed with poly-L-glutamate followed by electroporation results in more efficient transfection of the cells within the injected muscle.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the method of Alila *et al.* with a reasonable expectation of

success by: 1) interchanging the avian skeletal chicken skeletal α -actin promoter with the strong muscle-specific synthetic SPc5-12 promoter taught by Draghia-Akli, 2) complexing plasmid DNA with poly-L-glutamate prior to intramuscular injection of said plasmid DNA as taught by Fewell and 3) subjecting muscle tissue injected with said plasmid DNA to electroporation as taught by both Draghia-Akli and Fewell with a reasonable expectation of success. An artisan of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify the method of Alila as such because: 1) Draghia-Akli teaches that the synthetic SPc5-12 promoter drives high level, muscle-specific expression of operably linked nucleic acids, 2) Fewell teaches that complexing plasmid DNA with poly-L-glutamate prior to intramuscular injection and prior to electroporation results in enhanced uptake of said plasmid DNA and 3) both Draghia-Akli and Fewell teach that electroporating muscle after intramuscular injection of plasmid DNA results in enhanced uptake of said plasmid DNA. Increased cellular uptake of plasmid DNA and increased expression of operably linked nucleic acids contained within said plasmid would be advantageous when practicing methods of gene therapy.

Further, it is noted that pAV2001 (i.e. SEQ ID NO:1 of the instant application) is a hybrid plasmid consisting of fragments of the plasmids taught by Alila (citing Coleman) and Draghia-Akli. The specification on page 42, lines 16-19 recites, "An Nco/HindIII fragment of a SIS II plasmid (Coleman et al., 1995), containing the IGF-I cDNA and the skeletal alpha actin 3'UTR, was cloned into the NcoI/KpnI sites of pSP-HV-GHRH (Draghia-Akli et al., 1999) to generate pSP-IGF-I-SK3'UTR (pAV2001 – SEQID No.: 1)." Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would have realized with a reasonable expectation of success that the teachings of Alila (citing Coleman) and Draghia-Akli could be combined to generate the plasmid DNA consisting of the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.

Although neither Alila, Draghia-Akli or Fewell specifically state that IGF-I is an angiogenic factor, Isner teaches a method for stimulating angiogenesis in an

ischemic muscle tissue in a human host comprising injecting into said tissue a DNA sequence encoding an angiogenic protein, wherein said DNA sequence comprises a promoter sequence, wherein the angiogenic protein is selected from a group of angiogenic proteins including insulin-like growth factor (IGF-I; claims 1 and 16; col. 4, lines 8-10, 23). Thus, Isner identifies IGF-I as an angiogenic protein. Additionally, the prior art is replete with teachings to show that IGF-I is an angiogenic factor. Gonçalves teach that state that, "IGF-I has been shown to be an angiogenic growth factor..." See p. 296, col. 2, #3.1, Insulin Growth Factors. They further state that IGF-I seems to participate in inflammation-linked angiogenesis and/or tissue repair (p. 299, col. 1, #4.5, *IGFs and reperfusion*). Similarly, Nicosia *et al.* teach that IGF-I can stimulate rat aortic angiogenesis (see, for example, p. 1024, 1st col., 1st full paragraph). They state that, "Our findings corroborate recent reports that have implicated IGF-I in angiogenesis." See p. 1027, col. 1-2, bridging sentence. Accordingly, one of skill in the art, given the teachings of both Gonçalves and Nicosia would have had a reasonable expectation of success that utilizing a vector containing IGF-I would stimulate or promote angiogenesis.

Accordingly, in view of the combined teachings, it would have been obvious for one of skill in the art to utilize the methods of Alila, to intramuscularly inject a construct that comprises the construct as taught by Alila, Coleman and Draghia-Akli, and to modify this technique by electroporating the muscle after injection of the plasmid DNA, by methods taught by Fewell, with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make these modifications, as shown above, that Draghia-Akli teach a strong, muscle-specific promoter, and that complexing plasmid DNA with poly-L glutamate prior to intramuscular injection and electroporation after injection results in more efficient transfection of the cells within the injected muscle. The teachings of Isner, Gonçalves and Nicosia provide additional motivation for an artisan of ordinary skill

to use a nucleic acid encoding IGF-I to stimulate angiogenesis in muscle and further support that the claimed invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alila *et al.* (cited above) in view of Draghia-Akli (cited previously), Fewell *et al.* (cited previously), Gonçalves (Cardiovascular Res., 45: 294-302, 2000, Nicosia *et al.* (American J. of Pathology, 145(5): 1023-1029, 1994) and Isner (cited previously) as applied to claims 17, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 38, 41, 42 above, and further in view of van Deutekom *et al.* (Mol. Med. Today, 214-220, May 1998).

Alila *et al.*, Draghia-Akli, Fewell, Gonçalves, Nicosia and Isner are summarized above. They do not specifically teach mixing the isolated nucleic acid expression construct with a transfection facilitating system before delivery (claim 22); or that the transfection facilitating system is a liposome or cationic lipid (claim 23). However, prior to the time of the claimed invention, van Deutekom teach that intramuscular injection of non-viral vectors – such as plasmid DNAs – which are encompassed by the instant claims, are shown to have low transfection efficiency, and that these efficiencies can be improved by using non-targeted liposomes and/or polylysine-condensed plasmid DNA (see p. 215, 1st col., 1st ¶, Non-Viral Vectors).

Accordingly, given the combined teachings of Alila *et al.* Draghia-Akli, Fewell, Gonçalves, Nicosia and Isner and van Deutekom, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Alila *et al.*, utilizing a modified vector, as suggested by Draghia-Akli, and utilizing electroporation techniques, taught by Fewell, to mix the isolated nucleic acid expression construct with a transfection-facilitation system, such as utilizing a liposome, as contemplated by van Deutekom, with a reasonable expectation of success. Additionally, one of skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success of stimulating angiogenesis, in view of the teachings of Gonçalves, Nicosia and Isner. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to make such a modification, as van Deutekom discuss the low transfection efficiency in intramuscular gene delivery, and suggest using non-targeted liposomes to improve efficiency.

Thus, the claimed invention, as a whole, is clearly *prima facie* obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thaian N. Ton whose telephone number is (571)272-0736. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:5:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on 571-272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thaian N. Ton/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1632